



Memorandum of Meeting

Date: April 26, 2005

Time: 7 p.m. to 9 p.m.

Location: Main Hall, Ellendale Volunteer Fire Company, Ellendale, DE.

Topic: **Ellendale Area Working Group Meeting No. 5**

Attendees: See Attached

Mr. Robert Kramer opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m. welcoming everyone. He explained that tonight's meeting would focus on the Working Group's recommendations on the Alternatives to be Retained for Detailed Study. The meeting would also cover the opinions from the agencies based on a meeting with them on April 14th. He specified that the Working Group Members were not recommending a preferred option this evening, instead they were recommending reductions in the number of options. He then introduced Monroe Hite, III, DelDOT Project Manager, who also welcomed the Working Group Members.

Mr. Hite indicated that there is a full agenda including everyone breaking out into groups to discuss which alternatives they felt were not worth continuing on for further study. He requested that each group choose a spokesperson to report back the comments of each group to the entire Working Group. He then announced that this was the last meeting before a Public Workshop which is scheduled for May 17 from 4p.m. to 7p.m. at the Ellendale Fire Company. He indicated that flyers would be sent through the mail to indicate the series of upcoming workshops including the May 17th Workshop in Ellendale. He continued with the presentation and reviewed the items to be included in each member's project notebook. Finally, he discussed the Working Group Meetings, the Public Workshops and the Agencies comments, and used the three-legged stool analogy to explain the balancing of inputs to eventually obtain a preferred alternative. He then introduced Mr. Joseph Wutka to discuss the alternatives.

Mr. Wutka indicated that the Working Group members would obtain more detail during the breakout sessions. He stated that the alternatives for consideration by the Working Group involve a mini bypass around Ellendale to allow for population growth to spillover to the west and to accommodate the Ellendale Comprehensive Plan. This bypass was the outgrowth of the alternative discussed and drawn at the previous Working Group Meeting. He explained that the Western Bypass (Option B) parallels property lines and provides ramps for complete access between US 113 and SR 16. The impacts according to the matrix, indicate that 11 properties are affected and that it has significant impacts to



wetlands and state forest lands. The smaller Western Bypass (Option A) is an effort to reduce the impacts by staying closer to the US 113 Corridor. Someone from the Working Group asked what the dashed red lines on the plans around each of the alternative alignments was indicating. Mr. Wutka indicated that the red line was the limit of physical disturbance for the various alternatives. F. Brooke Clendaniel asked for the identification of the cultural resource impacts. Mr. Wutka replied that the cultural resources are identified by blue dots on the map. These cultural resources are locations where structures are 50 years or older and, subject to further analysis, might be eligible for inclusion to the National Register of Historic Places. The State of Delaware is also covered by a predictability model for archaeological resources. Mr. Kramer asked Mr. Wutka to remind people of the two columns in the Matrix of impacts. Joe specified that Options 1 and 2 are listed under Column 1 and Option 3 or the third lane is listed under Column 2.

Mr. Hite then discussed the Agencies' comments on their preferences for Alternatives to be Retained for Detailed Study, based on an April 14th meeting with agency representatives. He indicated that the Agencies' support the On-Alignment Options because they minimize impacts, particularly those to wetlands and forest lands. He also indicated that they do not prefer the overpass on Redden Road because it impacts more wetlands than the overpass at Road 565. He explained that the Agencies did not support the fourth and fifth columns in the matrix, the bypass alternatives, because there are too many wetland impacts and farm properties with prime soils. D.J Hughes stated that if the developers dedicate forest land to the state that there would be a net balance of 60 acres for the state and a net gain of 40 acres to the developers. In actuality, this would allow the State to acquire land instead of divide the land and help in the development that Ellendale desires. He asked the Project Team if DelDOT or the Town has analyzed the land for potential growth. Mr. Hite indicated that there are different impacts other than transportation in the study area west of Ellendale. He also specified that if the Western Bypass moves forward as the preferred alternative then the area west of US 113 will become the study area and there are conditions that need to be met.

Floyd Toomey asked the Project Team about the cost of the entire project. Mr. Kramer indicated that the cost estimates have not been processed. Mr. Wutka stated that the Third Lane Option is the least expensive alternative and all the other options have the same range of expense. The cost will depend on the length of the highway and the interchanges required for the project. Mr. Garey asked if there will be a cost factor for the land affected by the project. Mr. Wutka replied that property acquisition and the purchase of access and development rights will involve costs to the Department of Transportation.

Robert Short asked if a toll road or toll facility had been considered for the improvements. The Project Team replied that a toll road had not been considered up to this point.

Mr. Hite reiterated that the purpose of the US 113 project is to establish a corridor for future improvements. The anticipated increase in traffic and the relative lack of



development along the corridor, at the present time, is the reason for studying the US 113 Corridor for improvements and picking a corridor for preservation. Mr. Wutka indicated that this project offers alternate choices to an existing mainline that will be unable to address traffic needs in the future.

Mr. Hite asked that everyone provide feedback for the purposes of narrowing down the alternatives. Mr. Wutka indicated that the Working Group Members will break into groups and will have the five alternatives, previously discussed, from which to recommend. Mr. Kramer asked Mr. Wutka about the traffic analysis. Mr. Wutka replied that the traffic model is not complete at this time. Mr. Short indicated that local travelers use other roads than US 113. He specified Road 213 and Road 42 as examples of roads that the locals use. Mr. Hite indicated that the other roads are used, but Mr. Wutka indicated that this project is about offering people choices for the future. Mr. Wutka clarified that there was more traffic on US 113 and indicated that there was no difference in traffic operation for the alternatives under consideration. Mr. Hite indicated that converting US 113 to limited access would not occur with the third lane option. The Working Group Members then assembled into their breakout groups and a group was organized from the citizens attending the meeting.

Comments from the breakout sessions:

- Smaller Western Bypass is “off the table”
- Larger Western Bypass is to be continued for further study.

Mr. Garey’s Group:

- Option 1: Three people liked it and felt it was workable.
- Option 2: They felt it was not as workable as Option 1.
- Option 3: They felt it was not very comparable or workable.
- This group had high regards for the far out Western Bypass.
- Mr. Garey liked the Smaller Western Bypass because it has fewer impacts.
- The Third Lane Option rendered the least support.
- No support for the On-Alignment Option.
- The Group did not have enough time for the south end options.
- Some support for the Road 40 Option.

Reverend Ransom’s Group:

- This group had a difference of opinion for the Options.
- Some liked the far west option.
- Some liked the On-Alignment Option.
- Not much support for the smaller Western Bypass.
- Preferred the overpass at Road 565.

Mr. Bing’s Group:

- Preferred Option ½ with more support for Option 1
- Public safety and land development issues were the major concerning factors.



Mr. Hite's comments regarding discussion with the public:

- More support for On-Alignment with consideration of Option 1 and improvements to Road 565.
- Some public participants liked the smaller Western Bypass others liked the larger Western Bypass.

General comments regarding the Options:

Option 1

- Immediate plan includes growth towards US 113 in five years.
- Concerns for impacts on the businesses.
- Simplistic interchange.
- Provides better access to land.
- Allows easier navigation throughout area.
- Fewer impacts on circulating traffic.
- More support for US 113 bridging over VFW Road

Option 2

- Concerns regarding traffic impacts on businesses in the future.
- Farm equipment mobility concerns.
 - o Providing only one bridge might pose a problem for farm equipment.

Option 3

- Allows access to VFW Road from other service roads.
- Foreseeable problems in the future.
- Defeats the purpose of the project
 - o Traffic interferes with local and through (Floyd Toomey)
 - o Kimberly Brockenbrough stated that it does not meet the project objectives.
 - o William Downing indicated that it promotes development on west side of US 113.

Option 4

- Ideal for future growth of Ellendale
- More preference for Option 4 than Option 3.
- More traffic impacts on different kinds of intersections.

Road 40 and Road 565

- Not much difference between the two options
- The cost of impacting wetlands is worse.
- Crossover point at Road 565 is...??

Mr. Kramer reminded the Working Group Members that they were to not choose what they like, but they were to choose the alternatives that were to be retained for further study. He indicated that the Working Group Members will have the opportunity to provide their individual comments to the Project Team.

He then summarized the general comments he gathered from the overall Working Group Meeting. He clarified that there was a preference for the On-Alignment Option and that the SR 16 and Road 213 interchange options are to be carried forward for further study.



He indicated that there is very little support for Option 3, and that there is far less support for the smaller Western Bypass than the larger Western Bypass. Mr. Kramer finalized his comments by asking the Working Group members if there were any misrepresentations in the summary that he just completed. No response was forthcoming.

To conclude, Mr. Kramer asked everyone to fill out the individual preference forms for recommendation to DelDOT. Mr. Clendaniel asked if the comments and forms will be shared with the public. Mr. Kramer indicated that these forms and the comments will be revealed to the public, not as individual comments but as sense of the Working Group comments. He thanked everyone for attending and reiterated that the next meeting is the Public Workshop scheduled for May 17th from 4p.m. to 7p.m. The Working Group Members should attempt to be there for at least an hour to gain a sense of the community. Mr. Hite also indicated that the Public Workshops will provide boards that display the preferences and the comments from the Working Group. He announced that nothing will be dropped between this meeting and the Public Workshop. Mr. Kramer and Mr. Hite stated that everyone should encourage their neighbors and friends to attend. They then thanked everyone for attending and concluded the meeting at 9p.m.

Members who attended the Ellendale Working Group Meeting 04/26/2005

Brockenbrough, Kimberly
Clendaniel, F. Brooke
Davis, Mark
Downing, William representing Foster, Bishop Major
Dennis, Charles representing Reverend Richard Ransom
Emory, Pauline
Garey, Robert
Hughes, Kimberly
Kautz, Richard
Mitchell, Merriel
Short, Robert
Stallings-Davis, Ava
Toomey, Floyd
Truxon, Harold
Price, Reverend Calvin representing Harold Truxon

Public Citizens in Attendance:

Cox, Colby – New Measure Development, LLC
Hughes, D.J. – New Measure Development, LLC
Mulholland, Ralph
Webb, Donald – Town Council, 105 Main Street
Dennis, Annie M. – 18078 Beach Hwy.
Stevens, Tosha M. – 18144 Beach Hwy.
Katz, Kim – 41 C Blue Tool Rd. Selbyville, DE. 19975-9507
Short, Virginia – 12856 Dupont Blvd. Ellendale, DE.

Prepared by: Timothy DeSchepper

